



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,002	03/17/2004	Brig Barnum Elliott	03-4042	4392
32127 7590 03/18/2009 VERIZON LEGAL DEPARTMENT PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1320 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD 9TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2525				
EXAMINER				
OVEISSI, DAVID M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2416				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/18/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@VERIZON.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/803,002

Applicant(s)

ELLIOTT, BRIG BARNUM

Examiner

DAVID OVEISSI

Art Unit

2416

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/19/2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 and 29-35 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 29-35 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim 28 has been cancelled.

Claims 32-35 have been added.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 and 29-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Applicant's argument:

Applicant has argued that the amended claim 1 has overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections.

Examiner's Response:

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The amended claim 1 is still rejected because firstly, it is still a packet that is stored in a computer-readable medium (no support for it in the specification). Secondly, claim1 fail to recite any structural tie to any class of invention and therefore, do not satisfy the threshold tie to be for patent protection under 35 U.S.C. 101. In particular, the methods includes the steps of first value, second value that appear purely directed to mental steps or mathematical manipulations of functions that fails to positively recite the other statutory class (machine or apparatus) to which it is tied by identifying the machine/apparatus is being used, but the steps do not inherently require the machine/apparatus. Therefore, the method is not a patent eligible

process under U.S.C. 101 because it is being directed to non-statutory subject matter. See *Federal Circuit Court Decision, In re Bilski*, Appeal No. 2007-1130. Finally, it is not clear what is the purpose of a packet being in a computer readable medium (usually a computer program or software is stored in a computer readable memory).

Applicant's argument:

Applicant argued that "a compressed header..." as amended, independent claim 1 recites in part, "a compressed header comprising: a first value associated with an uncompressed header, configured for deriving a second uncompressed header for said packet based on said uncompressed header; and a second value associated with a third uncompressed header, configured for deriving said second uncompressed header based on said third uncompressed header." The Examiner cited the Abstract and Figures 1 and 5 of Svanbro as allegedly disclosing these recitations of claim 1. (Office Action, pages 5-6.) However, although Svanbro discloses a first and a second field in a header compression key, Svanbro fails to teach or suggest at least this recitation of independent claim 1.

Examiner's Response:

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The amended claim 1 has introduced new matter because first there is no mention of a tangible computer-readable medium in the specification. Secondly, both "a first value associated with an uncompressed header, configured for deriving a second uncompressed header for said packet based on said uncompressed header" and "a second value associated with a third uncompressed

header, configured for driving said uncompressed header based on said third uncompressed header” limitations are new and there is no support for them in the specification-the specification supports a first value associated with second uncompressed header and the second value associated with the third uncompressed header, and both value 1 and the second value are used to drive the uncompressed header. No where in the specification there is support for a first value is being used to drive second uncompressed header and nowhere in the specification there is support for the second value being used to drive second uncompressed header. In addition, the new matter of claim 1 has made the limitations unclear.

With regard to the last section of the applicant’s argument that the Examiner cited the Abstract and Figures 1 and 5 of Svanbro as allegedly disclosing these recitations of claim 1. (Office Action, pages 5-6.) However, although Svanbro discloses a first and a second field in a header compression key, Svanbro fails to teach or suggest at least this Examiner respectfully disagrees. The fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Applicant’s Argument:

Applicant argued that the combined teachings of Svanbro and Birdwell do not disclose the claim 1 limitation.

Examiner's response:

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Svanbro teaches that the compressed header consists of two values which are used as identifiers also, Fig. 1 of Svanbro show clearly that various uncompressed header enter a node which are compressed and the compressed header has two fields (two values) which are used to decompress the compressed header. Also, Svanbro teaches that in order to decompress a compressed header there is a need for a context (value) that is obtained from an uncompressed header (see column 2 lines 46-62). On the other hand Birdwell from the same field of endeavor teaches that compressed headers are derived from the uncompressed headers (see abstract and column 2 lines 18-20 "the compressed headers are derived from associated uncompressed headers", and column 4 lines 24-25 compressed headers derived from the uncompressed headers").

Applicant's argument:

Applicant argued that **Svanbro et al. (US 6,967,964 B1)**, in view of **Birdwell et al. (6,032,197)** do not teach or suggest that " a compressed header comprising: a first value for deriving an uncompressed header or said packet on a second uncompressed header based or a third uncompressed header".

Examiner's Response:

Examiner respectfully disagrees. **Svanbro** teaches that compressed key comprises two fields (see abstract "... a first subset of values for the first field of header

compression key is employed to distinguish between different header compression...").

Birdwell teaches that the system transmits both full-length data packets, which have uncompressed headers, and reduced-length data packets, which have compressed headers derived from associated uncompressed header. **Birdwell** teaches "...*The memory location holds the uncompressed header from which the compressed header was derived...The packet header decompressor then reconstructs missing fields in the compressed header from the full set of fields in the associated uncompressed header.*" (see column 3 lines 21-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are non statutory.

Claims 1-10 are non statutory subject matter because it recites waveform (packet) which is a frequency. Claims that recite nothing but the physical characteristics of a form of energy, such as a frequency, voltage or the strength of a magnetic field, define energy or magnetism, per se, and as such are nonstatutory natural phenomena. O'Reilly, 56 U.S (15 How.) at 112-14. Moreover, it does not appear that a claim reciting a signal encoded with functional descriptive material falls within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in U.S.C 101.

First, a claimed signal is clearly not a "process" under U.S.C 101 because it is not a series of steps. The other three 101 classes of machine, compositions of matter and manufactures "relate to structural entities and can be grouped as 'product' claims in order to contrast them with process claims". 1D. Chisum, patents 1.02 (1994). The three product classes have traditionally required physical structure or material.

"The term machine includes every mechanical device or combination of mechanical device or combination of mechanical powers and devices to perform some function and produce a certain effect or result. "Corning v. Burden. 56 U.S (1 How.) 252, 267 (1854). A modern definition of machine would no doubt include electronic devices which perform functions. Indeed, devices such flip-flops and computers are referred to in computer science as sequential machines. A claimed signal has no physical structure, does not itself perform any useful, concrete and tangible result and thus, does not fit within the definition of a machine.

"A composition of matter" "covers all compositions of two or more substances and includes all composite articles, whether they be results of chemical union, or of mechanical mixture or they be gases, fluids, powders or solids." Shell development Co. V. Watson, 149 F. Supp 279,280,113 USPQ 265, 266 (D.D.C 1957), aff'd 252 F.2d 861,116 USPQ 428 (D.C cir 1958). A claimed signal is not matter but a form of energy and therefore is not a composition of matter.

The supreme court has read the term "manufacture" in accordance with its dictionary definition to mean " the production of articles for use from raw or prepared materials by giving to these materials new forms, qualities, properties or combinations,

whether by hand-labor or by machinery." A manufacture is also defined as the residual class of product. 1 Chisum 1.02[3] (citing W. Robinson, The law of patents for useful inventions 270 (1890)). A product is a tangible physical article or object, some form of matter, which a signal is not. That the other two product classes, machine and composition of matter, require physical matter is evidence that a manufacture was also intended to require physical matter. A signal, a form of energy, does not fall within either of the two definitions of manufacture. Thus, a signal does not fall within one of the four statutory classes of 101.

On the other hand, from a technological standpoint, a signal encoded with functional descriptive material is similar to a computer readable memory encoded with functional descriptive material, in that they both create a functional interrelationship with a computer. In other words, a computer is able to execute the encoded functions, regardless of whether the format is a disk or signal.

These interim guidelines propose that such signal claims are ineligible for patent protection because they do not fall within any of the four statutory classes of U.S.C 101.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 2-10 are rejected because of their dependency on the claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim 1 contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled

in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 is rejected because first there is no mention of a tangible computer-readable medium in the specification. Secondly, both “ a first value associated with an uncompressed header, configured for driving a second uncompressed header for said packet based on said uncompressed header” and “ a second value associated with a third uncompressed header, configured for driving said uncompressed header based on said third uncompressed header” limitations are new and there is no support for them in the specification-the specification supports a first value associated with second uncompressed header and the second value associated with the third uncompressed header, and both value 1 and the second value are used to drive the uncompressed header. No where in the specification there is support for a first value is being used to drive second uncompressed header and nowhere in the specification there is support for the second value being used to drive second uncompressed header. In addition, the new matter of claim 1 has made the limitations unclear.

Claims 2-10 are rejected because of their dependency on the claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-10, 11-17, 22-26, 29, 31-32, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly

claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Amended claim 1 now recites that "a first value is being used to drive the second uncompressed header" and (a second value is being used to drive second uncompressed header" whereas the specification recite that both first value and second value are used to drive the uncompressed header. Therefore, there is conflict between claimed limitations and the corresponding specification.

Claims 2-10 and 35 are rejected because of their dependency from the claim 1.

Claims 11, 22, and 26 are rejected because the amended limitation "maintaining a history of the most recently uncompressed headers at the second network node" does not have any clear objective. In addition, "the phrase the most recently "is not specific and clear.

Claims 12-17, 29 and 31 are rejected because of their dependency from the claim 11.

Claims 23-26 and 32 are rejected because of their dependency from the claim 22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being anticipated by **Svanbro et al. (US 6,967,964 B1)**, in view of **le (US 6,300,887 B1)**.

For claim 1 **Svanbro** teaches a packet embodied in a tangible computer-readable medium, comprising:

a compressed header (see Fig. 5 COMPRESSED HEADER") comprising:

a first value associated with an uncompressed header, configured for deriving a second uncompressed header for the packet based on the uncompressed header (see abstract "a header compression key consists of filed 1(value 1) and filed 2 (value2)", Fig. 5 "PDU TYPE and PID fields of compressed header"-these header are used for decompressing the compressed header based on first uncompressed header IP, second uncompressed header UDP, and third uncompressed header RTP. Fig. 6 "compressed header consists of many fields which are used to decompress the compressed header" packet ID would determine the pervious received uncompressed headers such as IP, UDP, RTP the decompressing any of these field depends on the pervious received packets which are identified by the header type (first filed), and flow type (second filed) ", column 2 lines 46-62 " the many headers belonging to a stream

arrive at the decompressor node the decompressor node needs at least two values to decompress the compressed header one to determine which flow the compressed header belong to and second value to distinguish what is the header type.) ; and

a second value associated with a third uncompressed header, configured for deriving the second uncompressed header based on the third uncompressed header (see abstract "a header compression key consists of filed 1(value 1) and filed 2 (value2)"). **Svanbro** does not explicitly teach deriving uncompressed header from the compressed header. However, **Le** from the same filed of invention teaches this limitation (see column 14 lines 55-67 "uncompressed headers are derived from compressed headers"). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at time of invention to use the teaching of **Le** in the **Svanbro** header compression system. This combination is possible because any header compression/decompression is compatible with the **Svanbro** system. The motivation for this combination is to improve compression/decompression efficiency.

Svanbro does not teach where the uncompressed header, the second uncompressed header, and the third uncompressed header are associated with different packets arriving in any order. However, **Le** from the same filed of invention teaches this limitation (see column 33line 42 "missordering"). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at time of invention to use the teaching of **Le** in the **Svanbro** header compression system. This combination is possible because any header compression/decompression is compatible with the **Svanbro**

system. The motivation for this combination is to improve compression/decompression efficiency.

For claim 2 **Svanbro** teach a packet, wherein the first value is computed based on the uncompressed header and the second uncompressed header (*see column 2 line 36-62 and column 12 table 4*).

For claim 3 **Svanbro** teach a packet, wherein the first value corresponds to a difference between: a value representative of a portion of the uncompressed header, and a value representative of a corresponding portion of the second uncompressed header (*see column 3 line 6*).

For claim 7 **Svanbro** teach a packet, wherein the uncompressed header, the second uncompressed header, and the third uncompressed header include at least one of: an Internet Protocol header, a Transmission Control Protocol header, a User Datagram Protocol header, and a Real-Time Protocol header (*see Fig. 5 IP, UDP, RTP header*”).

For claim 8 **Svanbro** teach a packet, wherein the compressed header further comprises: at least one of: a destination address, a packet sequence number, and a packet stream identifier number (*see abstract “CID”*).

For claim 9 **Svanbro** teach a packet, wherein the compressed header further comprises: at least one other value distinct from the first and second values, the at least one other value for deriving the uncompressed header based on at least one other uncompressed header distinct from the second and third uncompressed headers (see abstract “first field and second field”).

For claim 10 **Svanbro** teach a packet, wherein the packets associated with the second and third uncompressed headers are consecutive headers from a packet stream (see column 2 lines 35-62).

6. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by **Svanbro et al. (US 6,967,964 B1)**, in view of **Birdwell et al. (6,032,197)** further in view of **Miyazaki (US 6,914,903 b1)**.

For claim 4 **Svanbro** and **Birdwell** teach all the subject matter with the exception of a packet, wherein the second value is computed based on the uncompressed header and the third uncompressed header. However, Miyazaki from the same field of endeavor teaches this limitation (see abstract, Fig. 1 (b) “difference data”, and Fig. 4.). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Miyazaki compression method in the Birdwell and Svanbro. The motivation for this integration is to provide a flexible header compression.

For claim 5 **Svanbro** and **Birdwell** teach all the subject matter with the exception of a packet, wherein the second value corresponds to a difference between: a value representative of a portion of the uncompressed header, and a value representative of a corresponding portion of the third uncompressed header. However, Miyazaki from the same field of endeavor teaches this limitation (*see abstract, Fig. 1 (b) "difference data", and Fig. 4.*). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Miyazaki compression method in the Birdwell and Svanbro. The motivation for this integration is to provide a flexible header compression.

For claim 6 **Svanbro** and **Birdwell** teach all the subject matter with the exception of a packet, wherein the first value and the second value are encoded by at least one of: a variable-length code and a sign-based code. However, Miyazaki from the same field of endeavor teaches this limitation (*see column 14 line s 5-10.*). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Miyazaki compression method in the Birdwell and Svanbro. The motivation for this integration is to provide a flexible header compression.

7. Claims 11- 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being anticipated by **Svanbro et al. (US 6,967,964 B1)**, in view of **Birdwell et al. (6,032,197)**.

For claims 11, 22, and 27 **Svanbro** teach a method/computer program product of communicating data, the method comprising: maintaining, at a first network node, at least an uncompressed header;

transmitting, from the first network node, a packet comprising (see *abstract*):

a first value for deriving the uncompressed header based on the second uncompressed header (see *abstract line 3*); and

a second value for deriving the uncompressed header based on the third uncompressed header (see *abstract first field, second field, Fig. 1 "24", "24' "*);

deriving the uncompressed header at the second network node based on the at least one of the second uncompressed header and the third uncompressed header (see *abstract first field and second field*").

maintaining a history of the most recently uncompressed packet headers at said second network node (see column 2 lines 35-41 "the context which is last version or uncompressed headers is maintained").

Svanbro does not teach maintaining, at a second network node, at least one of a second uncompressed header and a third uncompressed header. Furthermore, **Birdwell from** the same field of endeavor teaches this limitation (see *Fig. 7 "Header table" and column 8 lines 15-18*).

Svanbro does not teach receiving the packet at the second network node maintaining the packet at the second network node until at least one of the second

uncompressed header and the third uncompressed header are made available.

Furthermore, Birdwell from the same field of endeavor teaches this limitation (*see Fig. 7 "Header table" and column 8 lines 15-18*). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the header compression of **Birdwell** in the header compression of the **Svanbro**. The motivation for this combination is to provide a fault tolerance system.

For claim 12 **Svanbro** teach a method, wherein the packet traverses a connection from the first node to the second node that includes no intervening nodes (*see Fig. 1 "node"*).

For claim 13 **Svanbro** teach a method, wherein the packet traverses a connection from the first node to the second node that includes at least one intervening node (*see Fig. 1 "node"*).

For claim 15 **Svanbro** teaches a method, further comprising: obtaining the second value by computing a difference between: a value representative of a portion of the uncompressed header, and a value representative of a corresponding portion of the third uncompressed header (*see abstract field one and field 2*).

For claim 16 **Svanbro** teaches a method, further comprising: obtaining at least one other value distinct from the first and second values, the at least one other value

for deriving the uncompressed header based on at least one other uncompressed header distinct from the second and third uncompressed headers(*see abstract field one and field 2*).

For claim 17 **Svanbro** teaches a method, wherein deriving the uncompressed header at the second node comprises: if the second uncompressed header is maintained at the second node, deriving the uncompressed header by summing the second uncompressed header and the first value; and if the third uncompressed header is maintained at the second node, deriving the uncompressed header by summing the third uncompressed header and the second value (see Fig.1 "Node, 23, 24, 29₁, and 29₂).

For claims 18 and 26 a **Svanbro** teaches a method/computer program product of communicating data, the method comprising:

providing an uncompressed header to be transmitted (*see abstract*);

forming a plurality of values by computing, for each of at least two transmitted headers in the plurality of transmitted headers, a corresponding value for deriving the uncompressed header (*see abstract –field 1 and field 2, and Fig. 6 "compressed header"*); and

Svanbro does not teach transmitting a packet comprising the plurality of values, wherein packet is capable of being received out of order of at least one of the plurality of transmitted headers. Furthermore, **Birdwell** from the same field of endeavor teaches

this limitation (*see abstract –the server transmits a series of intermixed full-length and reduced-length packets to the client*).

Svanbro does not teach storing a plurality of transmitted packet headers. Furthermore, **Birdwell** from the same field of endeavor teaches this limitation (*see Fig. 7 “HEADER TABLE”, and column 8 lines 15-30*). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the header compression of Birdwell in the header compression of Svanbro. The motivation for this combination is to provide a more versatile deader compression.

For claim 19 **Svanbro** does not teach a method, wherein a predetermined number of transmitted packet headers are stored. Furthermore, **Birdwell** from the same field of endeavor teaches this limitation (*see Fig. 7 “HEADER TABLE”, and column 8 lines 15-30*). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the header compression of Birdwell in the header compression of Svanbro. The motivation for this combination is to provide a more versatile deader compression.

For claim 20 **Svanbro** teaches a method, further comprising: replacing one packet header in the plurality of transmitted packet headers with the uncompressed header (*see the abstract*).

For claims 21, 23 and 25 **Svanbro** does not teach a method, further comprising:

including the uncompressed header in the plurality of transmitted packet headers.

Furthermore, **Birdwell** from the same field of endeavor teaches this limitation (*see Fig. 7 "HEADER TABLE", AND COLUMN 8 LINES 15-30*). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the header compression of **Birdwell** in the header compression of **Svanbro**. The motivation for this combination is to provide a more versatile header compression.

For claim 24 **Svanbro** teaches a method, further comprising: replacing one of the plurality of packet headers with the uncompressed header (*see abstract*).

8. Claim 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by **Svanbro et al. (US 6,967,964 B1)**, in view of **Birdwell et al. (6,032,197)** further in view of **Miyazaki (US 6,914,903 b1)**.

For claim 14 **Svanbro** and **Birdwell** teach all the subject matter with the exception of a packet a method, further comprising: obtaining the first value by computing a difference between: a value representative of a portion of the uncompressed header, and a value representative of a corresponding portion of the second uncompressed header. However, **Miyazaki** from the same field of endeavor teaches this limitation (*see column abstract*). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to use the **Miyazaki** compression method in the

Birdwell and Svanbro. The motivation for this integration is to provide a flexible header compression.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 29-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

10. Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: **Hata et al. (US 2002/0059464 A1), Amri et al. (5,535,199), (US 6,882,637 B1), and Seada et al. (US 2004/0103277 A1).**

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID OVEISSI whose telephone number is (571)270-3127. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)? If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ricky Ngo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2416
